

GO 1314 9 September 1974
Confidential Intelligence Course

Section 5 Part C

EXECUTIVE DIRECTIVE FROM L. RON HUBBARD

LRH ED 67 INT

Date 15 December 1968

Electric Shock Cases

We are getting a lot of Electric Shock cases. They are coming in on petition lines.

Whereas most of these are innocent victims, the chance remains they are being sent in.

Such cases came in on Phoenix in 1954/55. They were instructed (under shock and drugs) to come in for processing, get it and go insane. One case, a girl, showed up with a cheque from attorneys. The money was put aside and she was placed in a motel. Sure enough her parents showed up in 24 hours demanding to know why we had "driven her insane" and sure enough the girl was now insane. But nobody had processed her or refused her processing. So the very crestfallen "parents" just had to take her away. The enemy plays it very dirty. Human life and sanity are trash to him. He has an unlimited supply of sanitarium cases and a complete disregard of law, human rights or the Nuremberg Code (established effective in all nations after the Nazi war criminal trials and signed by all nations which prohibits all experimental physical treatments").

To play it safe, do this on all new cases.

1. Always do the white form (pc assessment or history) on a meter. Do it all. It's an assessment. Note reads on the white form.
2. If any response greets "electric shock", date it and how many times.
3. Add the question "Were you instructed to come here". Clean it up as you can.
4. Get a full documented confession including (as found) who so instructed the person and where.
5. See whether the person should be continued in processing or not.

Many of these "insane" persons were never insane in the first place and process with remarkable ease.

Many others enter such fantastic enturbulation into the org that it isn't worth it at all.

Taking in "insane cases" is a good way to crash stats and a wide open door to the enemy.

The long run look at the "insane case" shows very poor chances. His brain and nerves are damaged by excessive drugs, shock and convulsions which the "psychiatrist" introduces as "treatment". This is covered by the way in DMSMH Book 3, Therapy, Chapter 1, 1st two paragraphs. (Page 173 in the DMSMH paperback, page 163 in the hard cover).

When an "insane case" was brought in to Wash DC the place would become enturbulated and the stats drop.

Such a case can actually only be handled under institutional conditions and then mostly to give the person rest and security.

"Insane cases" are made. We recently tried to recall one insane case who had not become so by modern "treatment". We could not find even one insane case who had not been in psychiatric hands.

So, such cases seem to be modernly made.

What is called "insanity" is actually a pain crazed condition. This would normally pass off. Brutality and injury to "treat" it only confirm it and we get an apparently "insane" person.

Psychiatric treatment of a person not already in a weakened despersed condition would be bad but would not result in "insanity".

A pain crazed person then so treated is very hard to fish out of the mess.

But more important to us, a person who has been institutionalized does not know what has happened to him. He was drugged so as not to know and during it was implanted and severely injured physically. So when we fix him all up and he seems to be all right, if he remains unsure of what happened to him, he again introverts (goes inward) and his nerves are injured. This often makes him a very very untrustworthy being even when processed. Understand me - he is now sane enough. He just isn't very capable. So if our target is able people, we won't recruit many from the physically injured patients of psychiatry.

Enturbulation is the key point. They don't flow, they enturbulate. You find their areas enturbulated. That's the prime symptom of the condition.

When they exteriorize from the injured pain wracked body they are sane enough. But if they stay around it, they re-interiorize. Sort of like trying to drive a wrecked car.

"Insanity" isn't an illness. It's an injury. When more injuries called "treatments" are piled on top of it, it becomes very hard to treat just because the person is now desperately injured. He hurts. His nerves as physical structures carry only hurt messages. So he is enturbulated.

It's the same thing trying to process a man in agony from a car injury and trying to process an "insane" person. You can't really get their attention until they cool down.

Why western governments allow these violations of the War Crimes Nurenberg Code (they all signed) I don't know unless they themselves are aberrated into vicious cruelty.

In our line of country just be very careful of the electric shock cases. And don't expect much. And be alert to them being sent in on an org to mess it up. We want smooth orgs.



L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Will Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Reimemo
LRH Comms' Mats
HCOs
To be included
In any answer
to such petitions.

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 10 MAY 1970

INSTITUTIONAL AND SHOCK CASES, PETITIONS FROM

A survey has revealed recently that when a person who has been institutionalized or shocked is given the right to be processed, in 70% of the cases the person did not arrange enough auditing to be helped.

If one has spent a whole lifetime becoming aberrated, it is not reasonable to expect it to be all undone in an hour.

Such persons often remain connected to people who have an interest in continuing them in an aberrated state. Such things make them difficult to handle as cases.

I do not want to be placed in a position where I would be refusing help to anyone who needed it.

The history of institution and shock cases is that they can be helped but that they do not continue long enough in processing to be helped. They become subjected to pressure in their surroundings to end off processing.

After causing considerable work by auditors, many such cases leave before anything effective can be done and ask for refunds which the organization is bound by its code to then make.

Anyone with institutional or shock history would have to guarantee to continue in processing long enough to be helped and to waive any right to refund.

It is not mandatory that either an organization or an auditor help them even when permission is granted.

Help is a two way flow. One has to help others to be helped himself.

Our organizations have the only successful record in this field. However, they reserve the right to require cooperation.

A petition from anyone with a shock or institutional record may be granted only with the stipulations that:

1. They obtain the consent of an org and an auditor to help them.
2. They continue in processing for enough time to actually be helped.

3. They waive any right of refund.
4. They follow instructions given by the org.
5. That they do not attack any auditor, org or Scientology during or after processing and post a bond not to do so.
6. That they help Scientology and help others.
7. That they sign and have any guardian sign a document containing these stipulations.

We can help those who have been injured in earlier practices. But it often takes a great deal of hard work on the part of the auditor and the organization.

Such applicants are special cases and have to be handled as such.

LEH:nt
Copyright (c) 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard,
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

BOARD POLICY LETTER

26 OCTOBER 1970R

REVISED & REISSUED 14 JULY 1975 AS BPL
(Revision in Script)

Remimeo
JRM Comm
Nat
HCO

CANCELS
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 OCTOBER 1970
SAME TITLE

INSTITUTIONAL AND SHOCK CASES

POSTING OF BONDS

(Clarifies HCO PL of 16 May 70 "Institutional and Shock Cases, Petitions From". Refer also to SPL of 14 Dec 1970, Same Title, Legal.)

There are many persons in the category of Institutional or Shock Cases who have been on our lines for years, have continued in processing long enough to be helped, have made gains and have supported orgs, have followed instructions given them and in general have maintained an excellent record.

These persons should not be arbitrarily forced into the same category as a person who is arriving at our doorstep for the first time.

Only those who have already shown that they do not as a rule follow one or more of the stipulations of the 16 May '70 Policy should be required to bind themselves to those stipulations when newly applying for service.

An HCO Area Sec is at liberty to waive the stipulation requiring a bond be posted if the person's record shows it highly unlikely that such a precaution is necessary, but is held responsible should trouble ensue and it is found that there were grounds for demanding a bond.

The opinion of the Guardian's Office can be obtained. The C/S can advise as to past case progress, the auditing actions to be next undertaken, the hours being purchased. The Course Supervisor can advise likewise with regard to student applicants who fall under the 16 May '70 Policy.

If all seems plain sailing, there would ordinarily be no reason to delay the person any further in receiving the service requested, once he has put his signature to the agreement laid out in the BPL 14 December 1970.

THE AMOUNT OF THE BOND

The sum of £100 (or equivalent) specified in the BPL 14 Dec '70 Policy Letter is considered by Legal as being appropriate.

One or two areas have demanded huge sums be posted in bond, thus effectively stopping any further progress.

It was not the intention of the 16 May '70 Policy to make it impossible for institutional and shock cases to

obtain training and processing.

If a person has already obtained the consent of an org and an Auditor to help them, there can be no reason to then block him off from that help by demanding a bond that he cannot pay for.

ROUTING OF PETITIONS

It should be noted that an HCO Area Sec, HCO Exec Sec or Executive Director or CO may be petitioned by an institutional or shock case. They do not all have to petition L. Ron Hubbard.

One whose petition is denied locally by an Exec Dir should be told that a petition may be sent to LRH and in this case a CSW on the why of the local refusal must be sent with the person's petition to LRH.

It is not correct that every petition on these lines must be routed to LRH, and to LRH only.

LRH Pers Comm

for

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Revised & Reissued as BPL
by Flag Mission 1234 2nd
Molly Gilliam

Approved by the
Commodore's Staff Aides
and the
Board of Issues

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY (R)

BDCS:LRH:CSA:BI:KU:MG:mg
Copyright (c) 1970, 1975
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

This is Reproduced and issued to you by
The Publications Organization, U. S.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo
LRH Comm'u Hat
HCOs
Legal.

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 DECEMBER 1970
Issue II

(Amends and replaces HCO P/L 1 October
1970, same title.)

INSTITUTIONAL & SHOCK CASES, PETITIONS

FROM LEGAL

Refer HCO Policy 16 May 1970, title as above, and HCO P/L 26 Oct. 1970 Institutional & Shock Cases, Posting of Bonds. An institutional or shock case, who, having successfully petitioned to be allowed auditing, wishes to commence auditing, must sign the following in addition to the normal contract.

"I.....(name)....., having successfully petitioned for permission to be audited, and having obtained the consent of.....(Org) and.....(Auditor) to audit me, do hereby stipulate and bind myself, in consideration of the foregoing and in return for auditing, to the following:

1. That I will continue in processing for enough time, in my own estimation and in the estimation of the.....(Org) and..... my auditor, to be actually helped.

2. That I waive any right of refund absolutely and notwithstanding any other writing, notice, offer or statement to the contrary.

3. That I will follow instructions given by the (Org) and those persons responsible for my auditing.

4. That I will not attack, malign, impugn, defame or in any other way seek to destroy, reduce or belittle any auditor, organization of Scientology or Scientology itself either by spoken or written word or by deed or in any other way either during or after processing, and as evidence of my good intent hereto, I post a bond in the sum of £100 (or equivalent) (refundable not less than 6 months after completion of the current auditing cycle, or at a longer interval at the Org's discretion).

5. That I will help Scientology and help others in full recognition that one has to help others to be helped himself."

Witnessed

Signed

PGO P/L 14.12.70
Issue II

- 2 -

C.B.S. Parsello
D/G/Legal WW

for

Jane Kember
The Guardian WW

for

Mary Sue Hubbard
Controller

for

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:MSH:JK:CBBP:kjm
Copyright (c) 1970
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 FEBRUARY 1971
Issue III

Re:mineo

INSTITUTIONAL AND SHOCK CASES, PETITIONS FROM
LEGAL (HOW TO POST A BOND)

(Cancels HCO POLICY LETTER of 13th Jan 1971
which contains a typing error)

Posting a bond in the legal sense does not require that the preclear should actually pay any money over. He merely signs a document binding himself to do so if he breaks his auditing contract.

A bond is a legally worded document in the following form:

BOND

By this Bond, I, A.B. of (address) (hereinafter called the preclear) am held and firmly bound to the (name of Org) of (address) (hereinafter called "The Church") for the payment to the Church of the sum of £100 as agreed and liquidated damages and not as a penalty. Sealed with our respective signatures the day of 19

Whereas the Church has agreed to administer to the preclear certain services known as Dianetic/Scientology auditing upon the express agreement that the preclear should enter into a Bond for the payment to the Church of the sum of £100 as liquidated damages and not as a penalty as hereinafter provided.

Now the condition of the above written Bond is such that if the preclear honours and abides by all conditions and clauses of all contracts between the Church and the preclear duly signed by the preclear then the above written Bond shall be void but otherwise the same shall remain in full force and effect.

SIGNED SEALED and DELIVERED
by the above named A.B.
in the presence of:

Seal

Signed.....

(The signature, address and occupation
of the Witness is needed on the Bond)

This document, of which there should be a single copy which is retained by the Org and carefully filed, must be signed over ordinary postage stamps to the value of two shillings and six pence (12½ pence in decimal currency). (In countries outside the U.K. there may be a similar Stamp Duty, which you can find out by phoning a lawyer.)

The advantage of this document is that the preclear is bound to honour his contract without any time limiter. No money changes hands unless he breaks it.

Another method is to have the preclear actually pay over £100 (or equivalent) which is paid into a special account and is refundable to him six months after the completion of his auditing cycle. This is in accordance with the HCO Policy Letter 14 Dec 1970 title as above. The money could be given to the Org's lawyer to hold on trust. This binds the preclear for 6 months minimum and involves an extra admin cycle, i.e. refunding the money.

C.B.R. Parselle
D/Guardian Legal WW

for

Jane Kember
The Guardian WW

for

Mary Sue Hubbard
Controller

for

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:MSH:JK:CBBP:pb:mes
Copyright (c) 1971
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CC Staff
 CC, Producer & Office Officers, HQ
 All Mission Directors
 All Registrars and Office Officers

10.3.72

INSTITUTIONAL AND SHOCK CASES: CHECK SHEET

There has recently been quite a number of institutional and or shock cases rolling up in Churches of Scientology. It has become apparent that the Executives in certain Churches do not know and apply the very clear steps laid down in Policy Letters.

In order to prevent institutional and or shock cases being brought on lines in violation of Policy, necessitating G.O. intervention, and in order to prevent future pleas of ignorance, the following Check Sheet is to be done star-rated by the listed organisational terminals. Checkouts are to be done with a duly appointed G.O. terminal.

In Churches, Missions or Franchises, where there is no G.O. terminal, a person will be appointed to do the checkouts by the Continental Assistant Guardian.

Compliance are to be sent to the office of the Continental Assistant Guardian, who will then report full compliance to the Guardian W.

This Check Sheet is to be completed within two weeks of the relevant terminals receiving the order.

SHOCK SHEET

Unless otherwise indicated all items to be star-rated.

THEORY

1. VCO PL 16.5.70 Institutional And Shock Cases, Petitions From _____
2. ECC PL 15.12.70 Institutional and Shock Cases, (Amend VCOPL, Petitions from Legal. 1.10.70 same title) _____
3. ECC PL 26.10.70 Institutional and Shock Cases, Posting of Bonds. _____
4. VCO PL 16.2.71 Institutional and Shock Cases, Petitions From. _____
5. ECC PL 29.7.71 Penalties for Hiring or Recruiting of Institutional or Insane Persons. _____
6. VCO PL 29.7.71 Hiring or Recruitment of Psychiatric Cases Forbidden. _____
7. ECC Info Letter 10.4.70 Zero rate for information _____
8. G.O. 294 The Routing of Petitions from Institutional and Or Shock cases Requesting Auditing. _____
9. G.O. 295 Petitions from Institutional and Or Shock Cases. _____
10. VCO PL 27.10.68 Policies on Physical Healing, (Reissued 23.6.67) Insanity and PTS. _____

PRACTICAL

1. Clay Demo what is meant by 'Institutional Case'. _____

2. Clay Demo what is meant by 'Shock Case'. _____
3. Clay Demo what is meant by 'Psychiatric Case'. _____
4. Clay Demo the actions you would take on being asked by a shock or institutional case to have auditing. _____
5. Clay Demo the actions you would take on receiving a staff application from a shock or institutional case. _____
6. Clay Demo each of the seven stipulations which must be complied with before a Petition from anyone with shock or institutional record may be granted. _____
 - (i) _____
 - (ii) _____
 - (iii) _____
 - (iv) _____
 - (v) _____
 - (vi) _____
 - (vii) _____
7. When permission is granted for a shock or institutional case to come on lines for counselling, is it mandatory that the organisation or auditor help them? Yes/No _____
 The answer is to be checked against HCOPL 16.5.70 'Institutional and Shock Cases, Petitions From'. _____
8. Who must be informed if a staff member or person on public lines is found to have withheld a past psychiatric or institutional history? _____
 Answer to be checked against HCOPL 29.7.71 'Hiring or Recruitment of Psychiatric Cases Forbidden'. _____

Gordon D. Cook
 D/Assistant Guardian in Africa
 for Jane Kember
 The Guardian World Wide

ll